



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,398	07/26/2004	Luca Poppi	034170-023	3503
21839	7590	05/22/2006		
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC (INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS) POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER NGUYEN, KIET TUAN	
			ART UNIT 2881	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/502,398	POPPI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kiet T. Nguyen	2881	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/26/10/5/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not define the limitation "MFA" as recited in claim 5.

Therefore, the Examiner don't understand what is the MFA that stand for?

Additional explanations are needed if applicant insists on including this feature in the claim 5 without the insertion of new matter.

Clarification without the introduction of new matter is required.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Imap Stiftung (EP 0 580 176A, 26 January 1994) (See document of 371 of PCT/EP03/02471).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hollander (6,614,039).

Hollander (6,614,039) discloses, in figs. 1-10, an apparatus using an ultraviolet light source to treat a packaging material (see col. 4, lines 52-61), which includes a protective sleeve 26 which acts as an insulating temperature layer, and is a film of a polymer resistant and permeable to the UV radiation, fluoropolymer material, and/or PFA (see col. 4, lines 26-30 and abstract).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollander (6,614,039).

Hollander (6,614,039) discloses all the features as discussed above except an MFA as recited in claim 5; the thickness of the film in the range between 20 and 200 μm

Art Unit: 2881

as recited in claim 6; and the thickness of the film in the range between 40 and 100 μm as recited in claim 7.

Using the polymer such as the MFA for protecting the radiation source is considered to be obvious variation in design, since it well known in the art to use the MFA for protecting the radiation source as Hollander (6,614,039) disclosed in the abstract that the fluoropolymer sleeve may comprise any suitable fluoropolymer material, thus would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the MFA polymer in the Hollander (6,614,039) apparatus for treating the material.

Using the thickness of the film in the range between 20 and 200 μm or between 40 and 100 μm is also considered to be obvious variation in design, since the thickness of the film is used to reduce the temperature of the radiation source that is effective to the treated material as Hollander (6,614,039) disclosed that the insulating protective sleeve can be a single or a double insulating sleeve (see col. 4, lines 48-51), thus would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the thickness of the film in the range between 20 and 200 μm or between 40 and 100 μm in the Hollander (6,614,039) apparatus for protecting the radiation source and reducing the temperature produced by the radiation source for treating the material.

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reasons for indicating allowable subject matter

The prior art fails to disclose a device for treating a packaging material, which includes a pair of substantially rigid grilles between which a film is supported as recited in claim 8.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiet T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2479. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R Lee can be reached on 571-272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KN


KIET T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER